



OFFICE OF
THE CHAIRMAN

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON

JUN 24 1993

RECEIVED

JUN 24 1993

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Honorable Thomas A. Daschle
United States Senate
317 Hart Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Daschle:

This is in reply to your letter of May 27, 1993, regarding the Notice of Proposed Rule Making (Notice) in PR Docket No. 92-235, 57 FR 54034 (1992). This Notice proposes comprehensive changes to the Commission's Rules governing the private land mobile radio services operating in the frequency bands below 512 MHz. You expressed concern about the impact of the proposed subsection 88.429 regarding power levels for two-way radio systems located in rural areas.

The primary purpose of the Notice was to foster emerging mobile telecommunications technologies that can help resolve spectrum congestion. While congestion is most pronounced in urban environments, the evidence suggests that there are pockets of congestion in even the most rural states

PRB
92-235
PV
SHA
RECEIVED
MAY 23 4 55 PM '93

United States Senate

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20510

May 27, 1993

JAMES H. QUELLO

2293
JUN 9 11 01 AM '93
RECEIVED

Mr. James H. Quello
Chairman
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Mr. Chairman:


We are writing to urge the Commission to seriously consider changes to the proposed rules in PR Docket 92-235 to make those rules more appropriate for communications in rural areas. We understand that proposals have been suggested to make the provisions of subsection 88.429 (dealing with power levels) voluntary for rural areas not within 75 miles of the nation's 50 largest cities. We further understand that a proposal has been made to grandfather all two-way radio systems in rural areas from the channel respacing provisions for at least 20 years.


We support the Commission's goal of encouraging the efficient use of limited spectrum by "refarming" the private land mobile radio spectrum. However, rural states like South Dakota do not face the same spectrum scarcity problems that exist in large metropolitan markets. Rules adopted to encourage new spectrum efficient technologies in congested areas should not result in obsolete equipment in rural areas and small cities. This result would unfairly and unnecessarily burden the citizens and taxpayers of less populated states.

Federal communications policy should be flexible enough to accommodate the differing needs of urban and rural private land mobile radio users. The aforementioned proposals address these differences without sacrificing the much-needed goal of making more spectrum available in urban areas. We urge you to give them your thoughtful consideration.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,


Larry Pressler
United States Senator


Thomas A. Daschle
United States Senator